1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
7	JOSEPH A. PAKOOTAS, an)	OF WASHINGTON
8	individual and enrolled member of the Confederated	No. CV-04-256-LRS
9	Tribes of the Colville	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
10	Reservation; and DONALD R. MICHEL, an individual and enrolled member of the	RECONSIDERATION
11	Confederated Tribes of the	
12	Colville Reservation, and THE (CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE RESERVATION,)	
13	Plaintiffs,	
14	and	
15	THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,	
16	Plaintiff-Intervenor,	
17	vs.	
18 19	TECK COMINCO METALS, LTD., a Canadian corporation,	
20	Defendant.	
21		
22	BEFORE THE COURT is the Plaintiffs' Motion For Reconsideration	
23	(ECF No. 1876).	
24	Defendant concedes reconsideration is appropriate and it clearly is based	
25	on Defendant's assertion that personal jurisdiction and arranger status remain a	
26	issues in this litigation, wholly independent of the issue of release or threatened	
27	ORDER GRANTING MOTION	
28	FOR RECONSIDERATION- 1	

release.

Plaintiffs' Motion For Reconsideration (ECF No. 1876) is **GRANTED**. The Plaintiffs will be allowed to offer percipient witness testimony which is relevant to the issues of personal jurisdiction and arranger status, including evidence regarding Defendant's intent with respect to its disposal of slag and effluent. Objections to this testimony, other than on the basis of relevance, are preserved and will be ruled on at the appropriate time.¹

No later than **September 7, 2012**, Plaintiffs may serve and file a supplemental trial brief and supplemental proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law limited to the issues of personal jurisdiction and arranger status.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Executive is directed to enter this order and forward copies to counsel of record.

DATED this 31st day of August, 2012.

s/Lonny R. Suko United States District Judge

24

25

26

27 28

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION-

To the extent testimony is offered by deposition, the court will consider and rule upon the objections in conjunction with its review of deposition testimony.

2

The court does not anticipate making pre-trial rulings on those objections.